UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/589,638	08/16/2006	Yuichiro To	294145US8PCT	2296
	7590 07/02/200 AK, MCCLELLAND 1	EXAMINER		
1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			WONG, JOSEPH D	
ALEAANDRIA, VA 22514		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2166	
		NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			07/02/2009	ELECTRONIC

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com oblonpat@oblon.com jgardner@oblon.com

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/589,638	TO, YUICHIRO		
Examiner	Art Unit		

	JOSEPH D. WONG	2166				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appea	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED <u>15 June 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.				
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appefor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Claperiods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	which places the r (3) a Request			
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	on.			
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	í.					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the state forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later that may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on tension and the corresponding amount of the contract of the correct of t	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee be action; or (2) as			
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	ance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be t	filed within two month	s of the date of			
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wit AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the				
 3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	ut prior to the date of filing a brief,	will not be entered be	cause			
(a) They raise new issues that would require further con	•					
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	**					
<ul><li>(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or</li></ul>	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying t	he issues for			
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).	, 0					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (	PTOL-324).			
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	owable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendmer	nt canceling the			
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provious The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of			
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-15</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overshowing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary.	ercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail	s to provide a			
showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  0. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.						
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER  11. ☑ The request for reconsideration has been considered but	does NOT place the application in	andition for all access	h			
See Continuation Sheet.		condition for allowari	ce because:			
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (I</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)					
/Hosain T Alam/	/J. D. W./					
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2166	Examiner, Art Unit 2166					

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: On page 4, paragraph 6, Applicant refers to an argument on page 10 of the previous remarks that Goodman does not teach comparison between data about files transferred to the device 300 and the data of the files stored in the host system 302. However, elements 300 and 302 appear contrary to the instant specification in that they are not present therefore the argument is spurious. In response that the prior art reference of Goodman does not teach certain features it is noted that neither the claim nor the specification recite said argued features. Therefore claims 1, 8 and 15 stand rejected.

On page 4, paragraph 7, Applicant argues that Goodman does not teach "said data processor being further configured to compare the unique acquired recorded data about the transferred contents with the content IDs of said contents stored in said memory". However, see Final Office Action page 3, last paragraph and page 4, first paragraph. Therefore claim 1 stands rejected.

On page 5, paragraph 2, Applicant argues that Goodman does not teach "comparison" recited in claim 1. Applicant further requested that the Examiner provide the basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied prior art. However, see page 5 of the Final Office Action, last paragraph. The Examiner's rationale is that a play list and search retrieval query to populate playlist necessarily and always involves comparison. Therefore claim 1 stands rejected.'

On page 5, last paragraph, Applicant argues that Goodman does not teach "said data processor being further configured to compare the acquired recorded data about the transferred contents with the content IDs of said contents stored in said memory. Mere allegation that the Goodman does not teach a "comparison" is not persuasive for reasons discussed supra. Therefore claim 1 stands rejected.

For at least the reasons above all pending claims stand instantly rejected.